

Customer No.: 31561  
Docket No.: 13184-US-PA  
Application No.: 10/710,696

### **REMARKS**

#### **Present Status of the Application**

Claims 1-21 are rejected. Specifically, claims 1-4 and 6-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(c) as being anticipated by Mund et al. (U.S. Pub. 2006/0030074; hereinafter Mund). Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mund in view of Kinoshita et al. (U. S. Pub. 2004/0232104; hereinafter Kinoshita). Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 10 and cancelled claims 15-16. After entry of amendments, claims 1-14 and 17-21 remain pending in the present application, and reconsideration of those claims is respectfully requested.

#### **Discussion of Claim Rejections under 35 USC 102**

Claims 1-4 and 6-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mund. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for at least the reasons set forth below.

1. As for example shown in FIG. 1C, the spacers 130 are embedded in the glue to hold the substrate 140 before the substrate 140 is ground. Due to the holding effect by the spacers 130, the substrate 140 is ground without damaging the device 114.

2. In re Mund (Fig. 9), the bonding frame 310 is considered as the spacer of the present invention and the bonding locations 314 is considered as the glue of the present invention by the Office Action. In this manner, the glue 314 does not contain the spacer 310 in Mund.

Further, in paragraph [0111] of Mund, Mund only discloses that the glass substrate 302 is polished. In Fig. 9, the substrate 302 is serving as a base for bonding. Very

Customer No.: 31561  
Docket No.: 13184-US-PA  
Application No.: 10/710,696

possibly, the glass substrate 302 may have been polished before assembling the device with the second substrate 312.

However, in the present invention, the dielectric substrate is ground after being disposed over the device on the wafer.

Apparently, Mund does not disclose the features of the present invention as recited in independent claims 1 and 10. With at least the same foregoing reasons, dependent claims 2-4, 6-9, 11-14 and 17-21 are distinguishable over prior art.

#### Discussion of Claim Rejections under 35 USC 103

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mund in view of Kinoshita. Applicants respectively traverse the rejections for at least the reasons set forth below.

Mund does not disclose the features as recited in dependent claim 1 for at least the foregoing reasons.

Kinoshita does not disclose the missing features in Mund corresponding to independent claim 1 and therefore in dependent claim 5.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 10 patently define over the prior art references, and should be allowed. For at least the same reasons, dependent claims 2-9, 11-14 and 17-21 patently define over the prior art references as well.

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

Customer No.: 31561  
Docket No.: 13184-US-PA  
Application No.: 10/710,696

**CONCLUSION**

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that all the pending claims 1-14 and 17-21 of the invention patently define over the prior art and are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Date :

Dec. 25, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

Belinda Lee

Belinda Lee

Registration No.: 46,863

Jianq Chyun Intellectual Property Office  
7<sup>th</sup> Floor-1, No. 100  
Roosevelt Road, Section 2  
Taipei, 100  
Taiwan  
Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800  
Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233  
Email: [belinda@jicgroup.com.tw](mailto:belinda@jicgroup.com.tw)  
[Usa@jicgroup.com.tw](mailto:Usa@jicgroup.com.tw)